



REMARKS

All of the pending claims stand rejected on the basis of Soultanian '092, alone or in combination with other references. Applicants traverse the outstanding rejections because the examiner's application of the '092 reference to independent claims 1 and 7 of the present application is flawed, and unreasonable.

Independent claims 1 and 17 require, among other things, that the moving piece of the claimed motor be hingedly secured to the stationary piece by interlocking the moving piece laminations directly with the stationary piece laminations. As has been explained previously, '092 does not disclose a motor in which the moving piece laminations are directly interlocked with the stationary piece laminations. In '092, a spacing member 48 maintains a space between the stator 10 and the armature 12. See col. 3, lines 45-50 and Fig. 2. For this reason alone, the laminations are not directly interlocked.

The present invention eliminates the need for the spacing member 48 in '092, by directly interlocking the laminations with each other. On page 7 of the office action, the examiner cites dictionary definitions of interlock, but not "direct." Here, "direct" means interlocked without the spacer of the '092 reference, without which the laminations would come apart, rendering the motor inoperable. The examiner concludes that the '092 reference discloses direct interlocking, but the reference does not support the examiner's conclusion because the examiner ignores the spacing member 48.

The examiner cites applicants' statement on page 8, line 6 of the specification that hinging can be accomplished in many ways. The significance of the statement, and the

examiner's reason for referring to it, are not clear, but it is clear that a rejection must be based on the claim language, and in this case, the '092 reference simply does not disclose (or suggest) hinging by directly interlocking moving piece laminations with stationary piece laminations in a vibrator motor. Accordingly, withdrawal of all the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.



By

Patrick G. Burns
Registration No. 29,367

March 29, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315
Customer No. 24978
P:\DOCS\2206\64630\883512.DOC